



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

## THE MONROE DOCTRINE AND LATIN AMERICA

BY JOSEPH WHELESS,

Attorney at Law, St. Louis, Mo.

The single purpose which moves me to a discussion of the phase of this subject indicated by the title of this paper is to endeavor to clear away the obscuring mists of misunderstanding which have been blown up around the Monroe Doctrine in its immediate relation to Latin America. "Ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free," is the inspired text of the evangel of better understanding which I come to preach. It is the same high desire as actuated Mr. Calhoun in his great speech in the Senate on the same subject—"I remove a false interpretation, which makes safe and proper declarations improper and dangerous." To accomplish this, I shall rely not upon arguments of mine own, and but a few North American interpretations, but shall appeal to the best accredited utterances of the most authoritative statesmen and publicists of our neighboring states of Latin America.

That a false interpretation and misunderstanding of the Monroe Doctrine, and of the policy of the United States thereunder, do exist, and have been responsible for no little ill-feeling and irritation, is unfortunately true and cannot be ignored. This fact was regarded by President Roosevelt as of such importance as to be made the subject of special comment in a message to Congress. In his message of December, 1905, he refers to this fact, and seeks to dispel the error underlying it in emphatic language:

In many parts of South America there has been much misunderstanding of the attitude and purposes of the United States towards the other American republics. An idea has become prevalent that our assertion of the Monroe Doctrine implied, or carried with it, an assumption of superiority, and of a right to exercise some kind of protectorate over the countries to whose territory that doctrine applies. Nothing could be further from the truth. Yet that impression continued to be a serious barrier to good understanding, to friendly intercourse, to the introduction of American capital and the extension of American trade. The impression was so widespread that apparently it could not be reached by any ordinary means.

Certainly no one has been more earnest or used more emphasis than has Mr. Roosevelt, in proclaiming the true gospel of the policy and mission of the United States in respect to the American nations, and in striving to allay the baseless fears of aggression and aggrandizement which many profess to feel towards the government at Washington. The truth of his so often repeated declarations of the good will and peaceful designs of the United States regarding Latin America cannot be gainsaid. From his repeated utterances on the subject two representative and official statements may be cited. In his message to Congress of December 3, 1901, the President said:

The Monroe Doctrine is a declaration that there must be no territorial aggrandizement by any non-American power at the expense of any American power on American soil. It is in no wise intended as hostile to any nation in the Old World. . . . This doctrine has nothing to do with the commercial relations of any American power, save that it in truth allows each of them to form such as it desires.

Again in the message of December, 1904, President Roosevelt states strongly his views of the policy and duty of the United States:

It is not true that the United States feels any land hunger or entertains any projects as regards other nations of the western hemisphere save such as are for their welfare. All that this country desires is to see the neighboring countries stable, orderly and prosperous. Any country whose people conduct themselves well can count upon our hearty friendship.

One of the most friendly critics of the Latin-American policy of the United States is Señor Alejandro Álvarez, of Chile, whose work, *Le Droit International Américain*, is a luminous study of this and kindred subjects. Frequently, in this and other published works, he calls the Monroe Doctrine "the political gospel of the New World." But this same writer expresses the further truth that there exists in the minds of many persons, even statesmen and writers on international law, a serious confusion of ideas as to what is the Monroe Doctrine; they confuse with it and attribute to it every action and policy of the United States having any relation to Latin America. Señor Álvarez goes directly to the root of the matter, saying: "Distinctions should be made between (1) the Monroe Doctrine in its primitive form; (2) the hegemony of the United States on the American continent; and (3) the imperialistic policy of that Nation." Failure to make these very obvious distinctions, due to confusion of thought

or to inadequate knowledge of American history as it relates to Latin America, is responsible for the whole unfortunate crop of hostile criticisms of the Monroe Doctrine and of ill-will towards the United States as sponsor for that doctrine, except such part of these attacks as is due wholly to the ignorance or malevolence of their authors. This fact is clearly recognized by Señor Álvarez, who says: "Publicists have not only failed to see the real origin and nature of the doctrine, but have disfigured its true meaning;" and he adds: "For the majority of persons, it is the basis of the policy of hegemony which the United States is developing on the American continent." Further, on this latter point he says:

These points of view are inadmissible, since the idea of hegemony does not grow out of the Monroe Doctrine nor is its development dependent upon it; and the same objection may be made to the attempt to include within the category of "hegemony" every step taken by the United States in international policy in the American continent.

The hegemony of the United States is the fruit of the prodigious and rapid development attained by that country, outdistancing the other American republics, and the *de facto* recognition of this circumstance not only by the states of Europe but also by those of America. . . .

The United States as the most powerful of the states of America becomes the natural spokesman of the continent and charges itself with the duty of making its ideas respected, to the mutual advantage of all.

This "confusion of ideas" in respect to the Monroe Doctrine, and the very prevalent disposition to make it a sort of scapegoat for all the manifestations of the policy of the United States, which are regarded by our neighbors as acts of "hegemony" and of "imperialism," has had a recent striking exemplification. This was the failure of the gracious and just act contemplated in the Fourth Pan-American Conference looking to an expression of appreciation of the benefits of the Monroe Doctrine to Latin America. The Latin-American delegations feared, as expressed by Señor Álvarez, that "while approving it, they might sanction along with it many acts of hegemony committed by the United States by which more than one country had felt its sovereign dignity to have been wounded."

This state of facts should give sober pause to all those in the United States who are charged with the important and delicate task of shaping the relations between our country and our neighbors of Latin America. The latter, it will be seen, cordially approve "the principles which properly belong to the Monroe Doctrine," while they

have taken offence at and cherish resentment of "certain trends of policy which are foreign to it," but which they undiscerningly confuse with the Monroe Doctrine, to its disparagement and to the detriment of the good relations which it is our desire and our duty to cultivate with our sister republics. It behooves us then, who desire to steer our course along the safe and pleasant paths of international friendship and goodwill, to do our utmost to dispel the misunderstanding, at home and abroad, of the true import of the Monroe Doctrine, and by future considerate conduct avoid all offensive "acts of hegemony" which are complained of, even by friendly critics, as having wounded the sensibilities and the sovereign dignity of our neighbors.

The most succinct, as well as authoritative, statement of the Monroe Doctrine is found, naturally, in the text of President Monroe's historic message of December 2, 1823. It embraces two separate but correlated propositions, the essential words of which are:

1. . . . . the American continents . . . . . are henceforth not to be considered as subjects for future colonization by any European powers. . . . .
2. . . . . we could not view any interposition for the purpose of oppressing them, or controlling in any other manner their destiny, by any European power, in any other light than as the manifestation of an unfriendly disposition towards the United States.

In THE ANNALS of this Academy for May, 1911, Señor Álvarez makes an analysis of President Monroe's Message, and deduces the generally accepted estimate of its political content. He thus summarizes:

The declarations of an international character contained in this document may be reduced to three:

1. No European country may gainsay the right gained by the nations of the New World to their independence and sovereignty.
2. The right is recognized of these same American nations to organize such forms of government as best suit their interests without the intervention of any European country in the affairs relating to internal regulation; and
3. European nations are prohibited acquiring by occupation any part of the American continent.

The foregoing simple propositions are the "whole of the law and the prophets" of the Monroe Doctrine. As Señor Álvarez proceeds to say: "These declarations, by their preciseness and definiteness, became henceforth the political creed of all the nations of the New

World. . . . And this is so true that all those nations strove for the solemn proclamation of the Monroe Doctrine at the American International Congress which met at Panama in 1826." No candid mind can justly discover in any of the propositions of this traditional American policy any broader scope or ulterior purpose than those stated.

In view of the carping criticism of our American patriots-at-large in aid and comfort of its ill-advised maligners abroad, we must discover what really is the status of the Monroe Doctrine in Latin America, officially and among those whose opinion is authoritative.

With the utmost enthusiasm and gratitude was the message hailed by the South American states, whose independence was forever assured by the policy declared by President Monroe; their governments, and the heroes of their independence, declared their hearty approbation of its principles. Bolivar proposed it for general ratification at his projected Panama Congress; and from that date, says Señor Álvarez, "all the Latin states have not only striven to proclaim it solemnly but also to unite to make it respected"—for, he says, it "expressed the aspirations of all America." A distinguished Spanish publicist, Exmo. Señor Alejo Garcia Moreno, in a study of "The Monroe Doctrine," in 1909, says:

These principles proclaimed by Monroe were accepted universally, in the first place, in the opinion of the people of the United States, and then in that of the other American republics, and the Monroe Doctrine was thus converted into a principle of American public law, which received its solemn consecration in the Congress of the States of the South, reunited in Panama in 1826.

The highest and most authoritative men of the states of Latin America are outspoken in approval and praise of the Monroe Doctrine, which has indeed long been an acknowledged Pan-American principle. Señor A. de Manos-Albas, called by the late William T. Stead "one of the shrewdest and ablest public men to whom Latin America has given birth in our time," says: "There was an element of prophetic inspiration in the declaration of President Monroe, uttered in 1823. It rang through the world like a peal of thunder; it paralyzed the Holy Alliance, and defined, once and for all time, as far as Europe is concerned, the international status of the newly constituted American republics." The brilliant Peruvian, Garcia-Calderón, in his justly celebrated new work, *Les Démocraties Latines de L'Amérique*, says, in grudging admission of the truth: "The United States proclaimed

the autonomy of the continent and contributed to the preservation of the originality of southern America, by forbidding the formation of colonies within their vacant territories, by defending republican and democratic states against reactionary Europe." Before the Fourth Pan-American Conference, Dr. Victoriano de la Plaza, Argentine minister of foreign affairs, recognized the same truth: "This condition of precarious autonomy and liberty of action, and the constant danger of being subjugated or suffering the mutilation of their territory, would have continued among those weak states but for the wise and famous declarations of President Monroe, to which we ought to render due homage." I present a final citation from the highest authority, the eminent Argentine, Señor Luis M. Drago, whose words are commended especially to those who persist in a misconception of the spirit and purpose of the Monroe Doctrine. In his famous note, in 1902, formulating the "Drago Doctrine," he appealed to the saving grace of the Monroe Doctrine as against European aggression in Venezuela; elsewhere he calls it "the formula of foreign policy of the new world." In a recent exposition of his own celebrated doctrine, he uses these measured and weighty words:

The Monroe Doctrine is in fact a formula of independence. It imposes no dominion and no superiority. Much less does it establish protectorates or relation of superior to inferior. It creates no obligations and no responsibilities between the nations of America, but simply calls upon all of them, with their own means and without foreign aid, to exclude from within their respective frontiers the jurisdiction of European powers. Proclaimed by the United States in the interest of their own peace and security, the other republics of the continent have in their turn proceeded to adopt it with an eye alone to their own individual welfare and internal tranquillity. This moral consort of intentions and tendencies constitutes in itself alone a great force without need of treaties or formal alliances or definite obligations. Thus understood, the Monroe Doctrine, which in the end is nothing more than the expression of the will of the people to maintain their liberty, assures the independence of the states of that continent in respect to one another as well as in relation to the powers of Europe.

Such illuminating statements of the principles which inspire the policy known as the Monroe Doctrine, and its hearty acceptance in Latin America, should have the happy effect of dissipating the misunderstanding of that doctrine which is so prevalent among many not only in Latin America and Europe, but among some in the United States who should better understand their government

and its historic polity. It may be added, that every nation of Latin America, admitted through the action of the United States to the last "Parliament of Mankind" at The Hague, has, in concert with all the other nations of the world, given its express assent to the Monroe Doctrine as an essential Pan-American principle.

The last word of authoritative interpretation was uttered but the other day by ex-President Roosevelt in his address before the University of Buenos Aires, in which he declared:

The Monroe Doctrine is meant to express the fact that the western hemisphere is not to be treated as Africa or mid-Asia is treated, as a subject for conquest by any Old World power. It is a doctrine which the United States promulgated, partly as a matter of policy in its own interest, partly as a matter of policy in the interest of all the republics of the New World.

And in expression of a very patent, but often perversely unrecognized truth, he added:

But as rapidly as any other republic grows to possess the stability, the self-respecting insistence upon doing right to others and exacting right from others, just so soon that country becomes itself a sponsor and guarantor of the Monroe Doctrine with which the United States of the North no longer has any concern, so far as the doctrine relates to it. . . . As far as you (of the Argentina) are concerned, we have no more concern with the Monroe Doctrine about you than you have about us. If ever it became vitally necessary to enforce it, each would help the other.

The Monroe Doctrine, in its pristine significance, is thus seen to stand accredited, approved, and adopted by all America; it has won universal acceptance on its merits, and needs no defender or apologist. It will endure as an active principle until its protective and civilizing mission is accomplished with the emergence of all the American countries into self-sustaining nationality; until, in the eloquent words of Exmo. Señor Bermejo in his closing address before the Fourth Pan-American Conference,—“the day when America entire shall have finished her institutional evolution in the sense of forming ‘an indestructible union of indestructible states,’ as runs the phrase consecrated by the most authoritative Areopagus on earth.” Then only may the Monroe Doctrine be dubbed, by irreverent schoolmen, an “obsolete shibboleth;” but it will be cherished by the emancipated nations as of blessed memory through all coming time.



As a ward against European aggression, the Monroe Doctrine is not yet "obsolete." Those who so passionately demand that we "abandon the Monroe Doctrine," show that in their zeal they reck not the lessons of history and that they "ignore the plain facts of the present." Señor Álvarez recognizes that it is still the welcome shield and buckler of Latin American independence and integrity, saying: "These states not only do not reject it, but have sought and always will seek protection under it whenever it may operate for their benefit." The Peruvian, Señor Calderón, who virulently assails the United States because of his own "confusion of ideas" respecting the Monroe Doctrine, terrified by the spectre which he raises before himself of a Japanese invasion and conquest of Latin America, "to erect there a new Japan," takes comfort to his fears, exclaiming: "The Monroe Doctrine, which liberated Latin America from the tutelage of the Holy Alliance, is perhaps destined to protect it also against the Orient." He begins his chapter "Le Danger Allemand," with the fearsome words: "The Teutonic invasion disquiets the Hispano-American writers. The tutelary protection of the United States does not suffice to make them forget the European peril." Elsewhere he dwells upon the fact that "tenacious Teutonic colonizers" flow into Brazil, Chile, and other countries of South and Central America,—"the German danger remains." As for Japan, he says: "her statesmen and publicists consider that Peru, Chile and Mexico are lands for Japanese expansion," and he gloomily predicts "a struggle between half-breed America and stoical Japan, in which the former will lose its autonomy and its traditions."

History has been a long record of expansion of active and populous nations into the territories of weaker and less populated states. There is nothing to indicate that this movement has reached its final period. Indeed, the struggle for expansion for over-flowing populations is reaching its most acute stage. The possibility of a "scramble for South America" does not exist alone in the fears of some South American theorists. Practical men of state openly express them, and some of the land-hungry have been frank to avow their annoyance with the restraints of the Monroe Doctrine. An English writer in the *Nineteenth Century Magazine*, December, 1896, speaks cynically and covetously of the alluring possibilities in a "scramble for South America," and says, "if it once begins, neither the latent resources nor the moral influence of the United States

will avail to protect its clients without the display of effective military strength."

Again an English writer, Mr. Somers Somerset, in the same magazine, for April, 1903, at the time of the Venezuela troubles, defines the "new economic necessities" which look towards Latin America for a solution, and says:

In proportion as the available surface of the earth that is suitable for colonization decreases, it becomes more and more evident that not only is there no time to be lost in founding an empire, but that the price which a people may be able to allow itself to pay for the acquisition of that territory is greatly rising. The constant pressure of the peoples of Europe, the commercial struggle, and the natural desire for national aggrandizement are bound to be powerful factors; and the consideration of "now or never" will very soon mark the policy of various European chancelleries. We have already seen that the Old World offers few attractions—there remains only the New World to be considered.

The veto of the Monroe Doctrine, in the opinion of this writer, has up to this time saved the American countries from European aggression; but he adds: "it must be remembered that during that time the world afforded many opportunities for colonization in other regions, and that that period is drawing to its close, and it is scarcely to be expected that a mere formula or opinion will continue to protect those countries for long." That this is a real condition, and not a theory, is the belief of the most accredited Latin American statesmen. The events in Venezuela, says Dr. Juan A. Garcia, are not isolated facts, measures of policy, or reparation of wrongs, "but the opportunity which materialized a tendency latent in Europe since the middle of the past century which in the last years has been emphasized and fortified by the new economic necessities." This subject is treated at length and very seriously by Dr. Luis M. Drago, in a recent explanation of his action, in 1902, in appealing to the protection of the Monroe Doctrine in behalf of Venezuela as against the aggression of England, Germany and Italy. His note pointed out, he says:

A danger that lay very near and it aimed to forestall it. At the time when it was transmitted everything combined to inspire the greatest alarm. There was rife in political and diplomatic circles a constant agitation which was dominant, and was disseminated by the greatest newspapers of the world, the most important and best accredited reviews and the books of thoughtful men, and which pointed out these countries as the best fields for the colonial expansion of the great powers, once the doors of Africa and the Orient were closed.

Thinkers of the highest rank have suggested the advisability of turning

in this direction the great efforts which the principal powers of Europe have hitherto made for the conquest of sterile regions, with rigorous climate, lying in the most distant corners of the world. There are also many European writers that point out the countries of South America and their great wealth, with their sunny skies and propitious climates, as the natural theatre where the great powers with their arms and instruments prepared for conquest have yet in the course of this century to dispute dominion. . . . The act of coercion attempted against Venezuela seemed consequently to be the beginning of the hostilities predicted against America.

Writing about a year ago in the English *Review of Reviews*, Señor A. de Manos-Albas calls Latin America "a tempting field for expansion," and frankly states the incentives which the American El Dorado offers to the avidity of the land-grabbing expansionists of Europe:

The territorial responsibilities of the Latin-American nations are greatly in excess of their respective populations. The seventeen republics from Mexico to Cape Horn, with an area several times that of Central Europe, contain at best seventy million inhabitants, who could be comfortably housed in any one of the larger republics, leaving the immense remaining territory available for European expansion. Can Tripoli compare with the broad and fertile plains of Northern Venezuela, bordering on the Caribbean? Or Morocco with the Atlantic coast section of Colombia? Can the Congo compare favorably with the Amazon, or Madagascar or West Africa with the inner lands of Peru, of Bolivia, or of Ecuador?

The consideration of such possibilities implies no wanton spirit of alarmism. If Tripoli has been thought worth Italy's present effort, and Morocco France's recent venture, why should not the infinitely richer Caribbean coast fare likewise? No one in his senses, surely, would outrage the powers by supposing that their abstention has been prompted by moral considerations; their reputation is too well established.

From the foregoing, which are but a few of many similar expressions of covetous desire towards the teeming possibilities of Latin America, may be better appreciated the significance of the avowal of Señor Álvarez when he frankly declares the reality of these fears and the only hope of salvation, saying: "The Monroe Doctrine, far from being a thing of the past, as some publicists pretend, is still of present importance in the sense that it denies the existence of territories '*nullius*' which could be acquired through occupation by European countries."

It is needful to consider briefly that "confusion of ideas" which associates the welcome and approved Monroe Doctrine with so-

called "acts of hegemony and imperialism," of which complaint is made, and which are, rightly or mistakenly, the cause of existing suspicion and ill-will. Knowing the truth and justice, or otherwise, of these charges, we may better be able to make any proper *amende honorable* for the past by more considerate action in the future.

The writer who most formally makes these charges and formulates the specifications of grievance, is Señor Calderón, in his recent *Les Démocraties Latines de L'Amérique*. He opens his chapter entitled "Le Péril Nord-Américain" with these ominous words:

In order to defend themselves against Yankee imperialism, the American democracies would almost accept a German alliance or the aid of Japanese arms; everywhere, the Americans of the North are feared. In the Antilles, in Central America, the hostility against the Anglo-Saxon invaders assumes the character of a Latin crusade.

It is well to examine for a moment his catalogue of grievances, which he reiterates as reasons for what he calls "an accumulation of hates" against the United States, and because of which, he declares, "the statesmen of the South refuse to believe in the friendship of the Yankees." After citing the "incessant territorial expansion" of the United States, from the Louisiana purchase to the Panama Canal Zone, he concatenates every cause of complaint which he can conjure to his imagination, as follows:

Interventions become more frequent with the expansion of frontiers: in the territory of Acre, in order to found there a republic of rubber-hunters; in Panama, to develop a province and construct a canal; in Cuba, under the cover of the Platt amendment, to maintain internal order; in Santo Domingo, to supervise the customs; in Nicaragua, to sustain civilizing revolutions and overthrow tyrants; in Venezuela and in Central America, to impose on those nations, torn by intestine discords, the political and financial tutelage of the imperial democracy. In Guatemala, in Honduras, the loans closed with the monarchs of North American finance reduce the peoples to a new slavery. Supervision of customs, expeditions of pacificatory fleets which defend the interests of the North Saxon, forced tranquillity and peace, such are the means employed . . . . The fortification of the Panama Canal, the possible acquisition of the Galápagos Islands in the Pacific, are new manifestations of this imperialistic progress.

A quite similar catalogue is set out in the open letter addressed recently to President Wilson by Señor Manuel Ugarte, the foremost apostle of the proposed Pan-Latin crusade against the "colossus of

the North." True, neither Señor Calderón nor Señor Ugarte shows wherein Latin America is wronged by any of the acts recited; none of the acquisitions of territory, for over half a century, has been at the expense of any country of Latin America; and every "intervention" has been in signal benefit of the country concerned and of civilization. The United States has expanded, in obedience to its "manifest destiny," until it fills out its continental domain; that is an accomplished fact, and justified by national necessity and by civilization. However, and far from a spirit of recrimination, but in justice to the truth of history, which is now past, and never, it is to be hoped, to be repeated, must it be said, that if any of the events instanced have, indeed, tended to give occasion for the irritation attributed to them, the acts complained of have been abundantly provoked. The United States, in all conscience, has been far "more sinned against than sinning." The truth of this is witnessed by the Hon. James Bryce, who very justly says:

United States statesmen found themselves from time to time annoyed by the perversity or shiftiness of military dictators ruling Spanish-American countries. The big nation has, however, generally borne such provocations with patience, abusing its strength less than the rulers of the little ones abuse their weakness.

One further citation of complaint from Señor Calderón. He quotes the eloquent and earnest words of Secretary Root, at the Third Pan-American Conference, where, "before assembled America the lay preacher of the new evangel" said: "We wish for no victories except those of peace; for no territory except our own; for no sovereignty except the sovereignty over ourselves. We deem the independence and equal rights of the smallest and weakest member of the family of nations entitled to as much respect as those of the greatest empire. We neither claim nor desire any rights, or privileges, or powers that we do not freely concede to every American republic." Over against these golden words, which Señor Calderón calls "the solemn declarations of a Puritan politician," he sets, misquoted and out of its context, the language of Secretary Olney to Lord Salisbury, in defense of Venezuela against Great Britain, to the effect that "the United States is practically sovereign on the American continent;" and Señor Calderón asks "Where is the truth, in the imperialistic declaration of Mr. Olney or in the idealism of Mr. Root?" I cannot

stop to demonstrate the fallacy of this mis-quotation, as I have done in my book on this subject; I will only say that these words, well qualified, were used in a "defi" to Great Britain, and to define the attitude of the United States under the Monroe Doctrine as towards Europe, and not as respects Latin America, as a reading of his note shows. And in 1907, before the American Society of International Law, Mr. Olney himself clearly defined the relations of the Monroe Doctrine to Latin America, declaring:

The United States under the Monroe Doctrine assumes no protectorate over any other American state; attempts no interference with the external any more than with the internal affairs of such a state; asserts no right to dictate the domestic or foreign policy of such a state; and claims no right to use force in the affairs of such a state except as against its enemies and to aid it in defending its political and territorial integrity as against any European aggression.

To persist, after reading the foregoing words of Mr. Olney, in appealing to his "practical sovereign" talk to Lord Salisbury, either to bolster up baseless attacks or to create prejudice, would savor much of the trick of a shyster lawyer in citing to a court an *obiter dictum* from a case which he knows to have been overruled. All fears of imperialistic expansion of the United States, at the expense of Latin America, should be considered as foreclosed by the emphatic and official utterances of President Wilson, at Mobile:—"The United States will never seek one additional foot of territory by conquest." Furthermore, whatever may have been the modicum of justified complaint in the past, the present is very pregnant with roseate prospects for a happier era of good feeling and better relations for the future. In this regard the earnest words of President Wilson in his Mobile address to Latin America are of propitious augury, and should find hearty response with every good American:

The future is going to be very different for this hemisphere from the past. These states lying to the south of us, which have always been our neighbors, will now be drawn closer to us by innumerable ties, and, I hope, chief of all, by the tie of common understanding of each other. . . . It is a spiritual union which we seek.

While the Monroe Doctrine protects Latin America from Europe, some of our neighbors cherish the fear that it is not a sufficient guaranty of protection against its own champions. *Quis custodiet*

*custodem?* queries Señor Calderón. And while Señor de Manos-Albas says that the Monroe Doctrine was like a gift in the cradle of the nascent nationalities, the latter have acquired the classic superstition expressed in *Timeo Danaos et dona ferentes*. A remedy to remove such fears, and to realize the auspicious avowal that "the future is going to be very different for this hemisphere from the past," I feel will be very welcome.

To broaden the Monroe Doctrine from a North American policy into a genuine Pan-American principle is the easy and welcome solution. Happily this is one of the most manifest tendencies of the times, as is witnessed by many authoritative acts and utterances in North and South America. As early as 1862, in a note addressed by the foreign minister of Costa Rica to the Colombian government, this "old, old story but yet forever new," of fears of the United States, is recited, together with some suggestions of current significance:

If our republics could have the guaranty that they had nothing to fear from the United States of North America, it is indubitable that no other nation could be more useful and favorable to us. . . . The idea has occurred to my government that a new compact might be drafted by which the United States should bind themselves solemnly to respect, and cause others to respect, the independence, sovereignty, and territorial integrity of the sister republics of this continent. . . . Resting upon a treaty of this kind, our republics would admit without diffidence, and without preoccupations in regard to the future, the idea of an intimate alliance with the North American people; they would feel as if they had entered into a new life, and be possessed of greater strength; they would get rid of the serious and just fears which our race has felt; they would march together with a firm step towards such a unity of institutions and interests as would change the face of the American nations, and lay the strongest foundation of our great continental alliance.

Señor Manos-Albas, writing on this subject in the English *Review of Reviews*, stated his plea for "a new declaration of Pan-American policy" in very earnest words, from which I briefly quote:

The means to accomplish unity of sentiment and to dispel the misgivings between the United States and the Latin-American republics is not far to seek. It is only required to amplify the Monroe declaration to the full extent of its logical development. . . . If the United States should declare that the era of conquest on the American continent has been closed to all and forever, beginning with themselves, the brooding storm of distrust will disappear from the Latin-American mind, and an international cordiality of incalculable possibilities will ensue, not only for the welfare of the American nations, but universally for the cause of freedom and democracy.

Commenting on this, which he calls "a masterly presentation of a plea for taking a forward step towards the world's peace," Mr. Stead says:

As there is not a citizen of the United States who desires to make any such conquest, the acceptance of such a formula by the Government at Washington would have as its first and immediate result the removal of the one great obstacle which hinders the extension of the influence and the interests of the United States in Latin America.

Practical recognition of the wisdom and desirability of a co-operative policy, and practical steps towards its realization, have been taken, and, as I have said, mark one of the most manifest tendencies of our international relations. In the first Pan-American Conference at Washington, in 1889, a resolution was unanimously adopted "That the principle of conquest shall not . . . be recognized as admissible under American public law." At the present time there is pending in Congress, twice favorably reported by the House foreign affairs committee, a resolution of which Mr. Slayden, of Texas, is the author, reciting that "the peace and commercial development of the American continent would be more certainly and speedily assured if the various South, Central and North American governments were reasonably assured against the forced permanent loss of territory as the consequence of war or otherwise," and resolves, "that the President of the United States be requested to enter into negotiations for the making of a treaty that will forever quiet the territorial titles of the various American states." It is understood that the executive branch of the government heartily approves the principle of this resolution and is working towards the end suggested.

Another step, already begun, and the ideal of Pan-American confraternity is happily consummated. The republics of Latin America have long been silent partners, and indeed the chief beneficiaries of the North American doctrine; that they would welcome being invited into full partnership, sharing in both its benefits and responsibilities, is evidenced by many tokens. Taking as an instance a possible intervention to secure the establishment of peace and order in Mexico, Mr. Sherrill, late Minister to Argentina, well expresses the advantage of a sort of American concert of powers, suggesting that, rather than action by the United States alone, that Argentina, Brazil or some other American country be invited to join with us. The effect of such



joint action he says, in the case instanced, as well as whenever "an occasion for armed intervention in this hemisphere arises," would

have two marked tendencies, both of which would be highly desirable. First, it would entirely remove any idea among our South American neighbors that our purpose was land-grabbing. . . . Furthermore it would be the best and most convincing form of invitation to Latin America to participate equally with us in the responsibilities and development of the Monroe Doctrine. The great Doctrine would at once become continental, and cease to be unilateral, which is today its one great defect.

Precedents for joint action, with the happiest results, may be cited. A signal example was the coöperation, in 1907, of the United States and Mexico in bringing order out of chaos in Central America, resulting in the notable series of treaties signed at Washington between the five republics. Later, in 1911, the United States, Argentina and Brazil by their joint representations, prevented the outbreak of war between Peru, Ecuador and Chile. These instances, as said by Dr. Blakselee, "show that the United States has already made a beginning of working in unison with Latin-American states in enforcing the police power of the continent. It only remains," he justly remarks, "to extend this occasional coöperation into a definitely formulated and generally accepted policy. The new Monroe Doctrine," as he terms it, "would accomplish everything that the present Monroe Doctrine accomplishes, and much more. It would create a genuine Pan-Americanism."

The advantages of such an international *entente* for the welfare of a hemisphere, inestimable in making for peace, friendship and civilization in America, are admirably stated by ex-Secretary Olney in a recent public address:

That an American concert of purely American states would occupy a position in America practically equivalent to that of the European concert in Europe; that it would tend to avert wars between states as well as insurrections and revolutions within states; that it would do much to further trade and commerce and intercourse of all kinds between the various American states; and that the United States, as a leading member of the concert, might be counted upon as an agency for good even more potent than if acting in the invidious rôle of sole and supreme dictator, seem to be tolerably sure results.

In South America there exists a great league and confederation between its three leading powers, Argentina, Brazil and Chile, popu-

larly known as "The A B C of South America." These great powers, among the most friendly to the United States, might readily be won into such a peace-making concert. These three great countries occupy much more than half the extent of the South American continent, and contain much more than half its population. The language of Secretary Blaine, in 1882, in reference to Brazil, is, *a fortiori*, much more significant if applied to the great A B C league:

Brazil holds, in the South, much the same relationship to the other countries that the United States does in the North. Her domanial extent, her commerce, and her advancement in the path of successful progress exerts a beneficial and lasting influence in South America. . . . All this tends to make that empire as necessary a factor in securing peace and harmony in America as the United States itself, while its interests in the great and humane results proposed are fully commensurate with our own. . . . What, then, is more natural than that these two great powers should earnestly unite in a movement which, it is hoped, will mark an historical epoch in South America, and exert its influence on countries beyond the seas, and on generations yet unborn.

Such an invitation to an American co-partnership, extended to the partners of the A B C league, together with several of the other stable republics, would, no doubt, be welcome and cordially accepted. The United States exchanges Ambassadors with Brazil and Mexico, thus recognizing them as equals on the highest plane of international society. A like exchange with Argentina and Chile would signalize our deserved respect for these potent nationalities and their welcome into the new American concert; a congress of these American ambassadors could readily consummate the "spiritual union" which President Wilson assures that we seek with the nations of America. The basis of such a union would be recognized friendly equality, and would necessarily carry the pledge of respect for their sovereignty and territorial integrity, so much desired by our neighboring republics. As said by the well-known Argentine political writer, Señor Leopoldo Lugones, in the *Revue Sud-Américaine*:

Never has the realization of Pan-Americanism been more necessary in the New World than now. . . . But Pan-Americanism means nothing without the United States, which represents in America the realization of the right to independence and the triumph of democracy. The first formula of Pan-Americanism, limited to the needs of the policy of defence, is the Monroe Doctrine. Its declarations constitute the most significant and decisive act towards guaranteeing the independence of the Latin-American states. Thanks to the Monroe Doctrine our territorial integrity has been preserved—and that in itself

is enough to insure the United States our everlasting gratitude. . . . If the Monroe Doctrine guarantees to these states the integrity of their territories and their institutions, Latin Americans have nothing to fear, . . . secure in the belief that the Monroe Doctrine, which yesterday assured our independence, will preserve it to us tomorrow.

I wish to close by quoting the eloquent words of Hon. John Barrett, Director General of the Pan-American Union, in a recent address which I heard him deliver in Washington:

I believe that the time has come when there can be evolved from the Monroe Doctrine itself as a principle, and there can be substituted for the "Monroe Doctrine" as a phrase, the principle and phrase of a "Pan-American policy." . . . The Pan-American policy would adopt, absorb and enlarge the Monroe Doctrine as an original policy of the United States into a greater and "All-American" policy, where each nation would have the same rights of attitude, the same dignity of position, and the same sense of independence as the United States now has. . . . By the substitution of "Pan-American" for "Monroe" and thus including all the American nations as sponsors; and by the substitution of "policy" for "Doctrine," and thus removing the hard, unyielding, dictatorial and didactic suggestions of the word "doctrine," a long step will be taken towards a new era of Pan-American comity and confidence. . . . Then we will have achieved that ideal, unselfish and fraternal relationship of the American governments and peoples which will give a new, worthy and permanently accepted significance to Pan-American relationship, Pan-American accord and Pan-American Union.

I have sought to present a consensus of American opinion as to the Monroe Doctrine, its past signal services, its present significance and its high potentiality to the future welfare of all America. I trust to see the early transmutation of the Monroe Doctrine into a Pan-American policy.